



**HAL**  
open science

# Role of circulation in European heatwaves using flow analogues

Aglaé Jézéquel, Pascal Yiou, Sabine Radanovics

► **To cite this version:**

Aglaé Jézéquel, Pascal Yiou, Sabine Radanovics. Role of circulation in European heatwaves using flow analogues. *Climate Dynamics*, 2017, 10.1007/s00382-017-3667-0 . hal-01373903v2

**HAL Id: hal-01373903**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01373903v2>**

Submitted on 9 Nov 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# 1 Role of circulation in European heatwaves using flow analogues

2 Aglaé Jézéquel · Pascal Yiou · Sabine Radanovics

3  
4 Received: February 1, 2017/ Accepted:

5 **Abstract** The intensity of European heatwaves is connected to specific synoptic atmospheric circulation.  
6 Given the relatively small number of observations, estimates of the connection between the circulation  
7 and temperature require ad hoc statistical methods. This can be achieved through the use of analogue  
8 methods, which allow to determine a distribution of temperature conditioned to the circulation.  
9 The computation of analogues depends on a few parameters. In this article, we evaluate the influence of  
10 the variable representing the circulation, the size of the domain of computation, the length of the dataset,  
11 and the number of analogues on the reconstituted temperature anomalies. We tested the sensitivity of  
12 the reconstitution of temperature to these parameters for four emblematic recent heatwaves : June 2003,  
13 August 2003, July 2006 and July 2015. The paper provides general guidelines for the use of flow analogues  
14 to investigate European summer heatwaves. We found that Z500 is better suited than SLP to simulate  
15 temperature anomalies, and that rather small domains lead to better reconstitutions. The dataset length  
16 has an important influence on the uncertainty. We conclude by a set of recommendations for an optimal  
17 use of analogues to probe European heatwaves.

18 **Keywords** Heatwaves, Europe, Atmospheric circulation

## 19 1 Introduction

20 There have been many studies showing that heatwaves are bound to become more intense and more  
21 frequent under climate change (Field and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2012). The evo-  
22 lution of the probabilities of those events and of their properties, such as intensity, duration and extent,

---

Aglaé Jézéquel  
LSCE, CEA Saclay l'Orme des Merisiers, UMR 8212 CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, U Paris-Saclay, IPSL, Gif-sur-Yvette, France  
Tel.: +33-169081142  
Fax: +33-169087716  
E-mail: aglae.jezequel@lsce.ipsl.fr

Pascal Yiou  
LSCE, CEA Saclay l'Orme des Merisiers, UMR 8212 CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, U Paris-Saclay, IPSL, Gif-sur-Yvette, Franc

Sabine Radanovics  
LSCE, CEA Saclay l'Orme des Merisiers, UMR 8212 CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, U Paris-Saclay, IPSL, Gif-sur-Yvette, Franc

is a key question for adaptation due to their impacts, including on crop yields (Ciais et al 2005) and human health (Peng et al 2011; Fouillet et al 2006). A first step is to understand the physical processes at play during heatwaves, such as the influence of soil moisture (Seneviratne et al 2010), or SST (Feudale and Shukla 2007). Yiou and Nogaj (2004) studied the relation between the atmospheric circulation and extreme events over the North Atlantic and Horton et al (2015) linked the increase of heatwaves to the increase of the frequency of mainly anticyclonic weather types. In this paper, we aim at quantifying the role of the atmospheric circulation during spells of high temperatures, that occurred in major European heatwaves. In particular, we want to understand which proportion of the heatwave intensities can be explained solely based on the associated atmospheric circulation, in an effort to disentangle its contribution compared to other factors such as global warming or land surface feedbacks (Shepherd 2015).

Our methodology is based on flow analogues (e.g. Yiou et al 2014). Historically, analogues were used in weather forecasting (e.g. Lorenz 1969; Duband 1981; Toth 1991; Chardon et al 2016; Ben Daoud et al 2016). They have been used in empirical downscaling (e.g. Chardon et al 2014; Zorita and von Storch 1999), circulation dependent bias correction (e.g. Turco et al 2011; Hamill and Whitaker 2006; Hamill et al 2015; Djalalova et al 2015), in combination with ensemble data assimilation (Tandeo et al 2015), in probabilistic wind energy potential estimation (Vanvyve et al 2015), and paleo climate reconstruction (Schenk and Zorita 2012; G omez-Navarro et al 2014).

Here, the analogues are defined as days with an atmospheric circulation similar to the day of interest. The underlying assumption is that the circulation has an influence on more local climate variables such as temperature and that therefore the temperature in a specific region given a certain type of circulation has a more narrow distribution than the unconditioned temperature in the same region. To isolate the influence of certain types of circulation on the temperature, we compare the probability density functions of temperature anomalies reconstructed for both randomly picked days and days picked among analogues. The analogues depend on many parameters, including the size of the domain of computation, or the length of the dataset. The goal of this paper is to provide general guidelines to choose those parameters to get flow analogues adapted to the study of European summer heatwaves. Those guidelines are obtained from four emblematic cases of heatwaves. Our paper explores physical parameters on which the analogues are computed, and focuses on temperature reconstructions.

Section 2 details the methodology used in this study. Section 3 tests the sensitivity of several physical and statistical parameters on which the methodology is based. A part of this section is devoted to a qualitative evaluation of the uncertainty related to the limited size of the datasets. Section 4 focuses on the role played by the circulation in each of the chosen case studies. The results are discussed in Section 5 and conclusions appear in Section 6.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Heatwave selection

We focus on heatwaves occurring during the summer months (June–July–August: JJA), knowing that the processes involved in the development of a heatwave vary from one season to the other. We chose heatwaves that stroke Europe since 2000: June and August 2003 (e.g. Beniston and Diaz 2004; Fischer et al

2007; Cassou et al 2005) in Western Europe (WE), July 2006 (Rebetez et al 2009) in Northern Europe (NE), and July 2015 (Russo et al 2015) in Southern Europe (SE). We chose to study June and August 2003 and not the whole summer for consistency in the length of the studied heatwaves. Furthermore, both heatwaves have been studied separately by Stéfanon et al (2012). We use the NCEP reanalysis I dataset (Kalnay et al 1996), which provides us with 68 years of data from 1948 to 2016. The advantage of this dataset is that it is updated near real time (with a three days delay), so that the methodology could give results already a few days after a given event. Longer datasets like ERA20C (Poli et al 2016) or the NCEP 20th Century Reanalysis (Compo et al 2011) are less frequently updated or do not include 2015, and were therefore not retained.

The peak temperatures occurred in different regions for each heatwave. These regions correspond to the black boxes in figure 1. They are centered on the region of highest temperature anomaly. The size of the boxes was defined such that the monthly temperature anomalies averaged over them are records (see figure 2). Hence we identify two heatwaves in 2003, in June and August, which is consistent with Stéfanon et al (2012). Choosing a slightly larger box does not alter the results or the methodology.




Fig. 1: Monthly mean temperature anomalies over land areas (NCEP dataset with reference to the 1948-2015 mean) for the four case studies (in  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The black rectangles indicate the regions of interest for the rest of the study.

81 We observe a significant linear temperature trend ( $p - value < 0.05$ ), related to climate change, for each  
 82 month and region studied (red lines in figure 2): 0.23 °C per decade for June (WE), 0.24 °C for July (NE  
 83 and SE) and 0.25 °C for August(WE). For the rest of the study we calculate detrended temperatures  
 84 using a non-linear trend, calculated with a cubic smoothing spline (green lines in figure 2). The reason is  
 85 to extract the role of circulation in high temperature extremes, regardless of the state of the background  
 86 climate, the evolution of which is non-linear.

87




Fig. 2: Evolution of the monthly temperature anomalies averaged over the regions defined in figure 1. The red line corresponds to the linear trend, which is significant ( $p - value < 0.05$ ) in all cases. The green line corresponds to a non linear trend calculated with a cubic smoothing spline.

## 88 2.2 Flow analogues

89 We used flow analogues to extract the contribution of circulation dynamics to the chosen heatwave events  
 90 comparing their temperature anomalies to those of analogues. Analogues were defined as the  $N$  days with  
 91 the most similar detrended sea level pressure (SLP) or geopotential height at 500 hPa (Z500) anomaly  
 92 fields. The similarity was measured with the Euclidean distance between two maps (Yiou 2014). We only  
 93 considered the days within a 61 calendar days (30 days before and 30 days after) window centered on  
 94 the day of interest because of the seasonal cycle of both circulation and temperature (Yiou et al 2012).

95 We further exclude the days coming from the same year as the event from the 1948–2015 data set, be-  
 96 cause of the persistence of the circulation. The program used to compute analogues CASTf90 is available  
 97 online (<https://a2c2.lsce.ipsl.fr/index.php/licences/file/castf90?id=3>). Once the analogues  
 98 were selected, we came back to the observable of interest (the detrended temperature anomalies) on those  
 99 selected days. The whole process is summarized in figure 3.

100




Fig. 3: A day with an extreme temperature anomaly (map on the top left) has a corresponding circulation, represented by the geopotential at 500 hPa (map on the bottom left). Flow analogues are days within the database which have a similar circulation to the day of interest (maps on the bottom right). The temperature anomalies of the analogues (maps on the top right) are then compared to the temperature anomalies of the day of interest (map on the top left).

Days of the event	Corresponding analogues	Randomly picked analogue
01/07/2015	$\text{ana}_1^1, \text{ana}_1^2, \dots, \text{ana}_1^N$	$\text{ana}_1^i$
02/07/2015	$\text{ana}_2^1, \text{ana}_2^2, \dots, \text{ana}_2^N$	$\text{ana}_2^i$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
31/07/2015	$\text{ana}_{31}^1, \text{ana}_{31}^2, \dots, \text{ana}_{31}^N$	$\text{ana}_{31}^i$

Table 1: Simulation of uchronic months using randomly picked analogues for July 2015.

### 101 2.3 Reconstruction of temperature distributions

102 Our goal is to reconstruct the probability distribution of detrended temperature anomalies conditional  
103 to the atmospheric circulation. For this, we consider a day  $i$ , with a temperature  $T_i$  and a circulation  
104  $C_i$  with  $N$  analogues  $C_i^1 \dots, C_i^N$ . The circulation analogues  $\text{ana}_i^1 \dots \text{ana}_i^N$  provide  $N$  copies of detrended  
105 temperature anomalies. Hence, we can recreate a sequence of daily temperature anomalies over a month  
106 by randomly picking one of the  $N$  best analogues for each day. The resulting monthly mean tempera-  
107 ture anomaly is called *uchronic*, because it is a temperature anomaly that might have occurred for a  
108 given circulation pattern sequence. By reiterating this process, we recreated probability distributions of  
109 uchronic monthly detrended temperature anomalies conditional to the atmospheric circulation. We then  
110 compared this distribution to a distribution built from random days instead of analogues. In the rest  
111 of the article, we set the number of random iterations to 1000. This procedure is a simplified version of  
112 the stochastic weather generator of Yiou (2014), who also used weights based on the distances of the  
113 analogues. Table 1 illustrates this process for the July 2015 case.

114

## 115 3 Parameter sensitivity tests

116 The presented method depends on a few parameters. Their choice has an influence on both the results  
117 and their robustness. The following section explores the role of those parameters and how tuning them  
118 may give us further information on the relationship between circulation patterns and extreme tempera-  
119 ture anomalies. We also want to know whether those parameters should depend on the specific event or  
120 not. This determines how general the approach can be and therefore its potential application to future  
121 events and other extra-tropical regions. In particular, we studied the role played by physical parameters:  
122 the variable on which the analogues are computed (SLP or Z500), the choice of the size of the domain  
123 on which the analogues are computed, and the length of the dataset, and a statistical parameter: the  
124 number  $N$  of analogues we kept.

125

### 126 3.1 Variable representing the circulation

127 SLP (e.g. Cassou and Cattiaux 2016; Sutton and Hodson 2005; Della-Marta et al 2007) and Z500 (e.g.  
128 Horton et al 2015; Quesada et al 2012; Dole et al 2011) are the most commonly used variables to study  
129 the atmospheric circulation. We calculated analogues using either the detrended SLP or the detrended  
130 Z500. The detrending was needed due to the dependence of Z500 on lower tropospheric temperatures,  
131 which are increasing due to anthropogenic climate change. We also detrended SLP since we found a small




Fig. 4: The probability density of uchronic temperature anomalies from circulation analogues generated using detrended SLP (left boxplot of each subfigure) or detrended geopotential height at 500 hPa (right boxplot of each subfigure) for each case study: June 2003 (a), August 2003 (b), July 2007 (c), July 2015 (d). The red line represents the observed detrended temperature anomaly of the event. The three lines composing the boxplot are respectively from bottom to top, the 25th ( $q_{25}$ ), median ( $q_{50}$ ) and 75th quantiles ( $q_{75}$ ). The value of the upper whiskers is  $\min(1.5 \times (q_{75} - q_{25}) + q_{50}, \max(\text{temperature anomaly}))$ . The value of the lower whiskers is its conjugate.

132 significant positive trend of mean monthly SLP over the North Atlantic domain for the 1948-2015 period.

133

134 The detrending of SLP and Z500 was done by computing a monthly spatial average of those fields.  
 135 Then a non-linear trend was calculated with a cubic smoothing spline (Green and Silverman 1994), in  
 136 order to take into account the non linearity of climate change. This trend was removed to daily fields,  
 137 which preserves the circulation patterns. We calculated the trends for both the North Atlantic region  
 138 and the smaller regions on which the analogues are calculated. The differences between the trends for  
 139 both regions were small. We did the detrending on the North Atlantic region in this study because the  
 140 uncertainties on circulation patterns are amplified for smaller regions, especially as the NCEP reanalysis  
 141 I grid is coarse (with a resolution of about 210km).

142

143 The uchronic detrended temperature anomalies for each event that were calculated using analogues  
 144 of detrended SLP or detrended Z500 are shown in figure 4. The analogues computed using Z500 give  
 145 uchronic temperature anomalies closer to the observed detrended temperature anomaly of the event than  
 146 those computed using SLP. For the July 2015 case with an observed detrended temperature anomaly of  
 147  $2.06^\circ\text{C}$  for example the mean of uchronic temperature anomalies calculated using SLP is  $0.73^\circ\text{C}$  while  
 148 the mean uchronic temperature anomaly calculated using Z500 is  $1.76^\circ\text{C}$ . The results are qualitatively  
 149 similar for the other cases. The better performance of the Z500 analogues compared to the SLP analogues  
 150 is probably related to the heat low process (e.g. Portela and Castro 1996). Warm anomalies of surface  
 151 temperature lead to convection. The elevation of warm air masses creates a local depression, which adds



152 on top of an anticyclonic anomaly a cyclonic anomaly. This flattens the SLP patterns and blurs the  
153 signal, which does not happen with Z500. By using Z500 we also avoid any influence of the relief. Hence,  
154 we kept the detrended Z500 to compute the analogues for the rest of the study.

### 156 3.2 Size of the domain

157 The scale on which we compare circulation patterns plays a key role in the computation of the analogues.  
158 If the domain is too large, the system becomes too complicated, with too many degrees of freedom. The  
159 analogues could consequently only extract a low frequency signal, like the seasonal cycle. Van den Dool  
160 (1994) evaluates that it would take  $10^{30}$  years of data to find two matching observed flows for analogues  
161 computed over the Northern Hemisphere. If we choose too small a domain, then we cannot study the role  
162 of the synoptic circulation. So, on the one hand, it is no use to calculate analogues on whole hemispheres,  
163 and on the other hand, we do not want to select domains which are smaller than the typical scale of  
164 extra-tropical cyclones (1000 km approximately). Radanovics et al (2013) investigated automatic algo-  
165 rithms to adjust the domain size of the analogues for precipitation. Here, we prefer to select a domain  
166 that yields an a priori physical relevance to account for the most important features of the flow that  
167 affects high temperatures in Europe.

168  
169 The ideal size of the domain reveals the scale at which the processes are relevant and may very well vary  
170 from one event to the other. This especially applies for studies on other types of events such as heavy  
171 precipitation, droughts or storms. We compared three different domains shown in figure 5 (right hand  
172 side):

- 173 – a large domain (the whole maps in figure 5), including the North Atlantic region, which corresponds
- 174 to the domain usually used to calculate weather regimes (Vautard 1990; Michelangeli et al 1995),
- 175 – a medium domain (the golden rectangles in figure 5), centered on Europe, which is much smaller than
- 176 the North Atlantic domain while being common to all events, and
- 177 – a small domain tailored for each event (the purple rectangles in figure 5), depending on the circulation
- 178 pattern of the specific summer .

179 The results are displayed on the left hand side of figure 5. The detrended temperature anomalies of  
180 the heatwaves of interest, shown by the red lines, are better reproduced using the smaller domains to  
181 calculate the circulation analogues for all four cases. This is because there are circulation patterns in-  
182 cluded in the North Atlantic domain which probably play no role in the establishment of a heatwave  
183 over Europe. For example in July 2015 we observe an important anticyclonic anomaly over Greenland. It  
184 adds a constraint on the analogues while supposedly playing no role on the lesser anticyclonic anomaly  
185 over the Northern Mediterranean region. The standard deviation of the uchronic detrended temperature  
186 anomalies also decreases with the size of the domain.

187  
188 It is relevant to rely on standard domains for a first estimation of the role played by the circulation in  
189 the occurrence of a heatwave, for example by using the regions defined in Field and Intergovernmental  
190 Panel on Climate Change (2012). However, for a finer analysis focused on one specific heatwave, or a  
191 few given events, the choice of a tailored small domain gives better results. In the rest of the study, we  
192 hence kept the smaller domains.




Fig. 5: Dependence of the probability density of uchronic detrended temperatures on the size of the domain. The maps on the right column represent the detrended Z500 monthly anomaly (m). The purple rectangles indicate the smallest zones of computation of flow analogues. The golden rectangles indicate the medium zone of computation of flow analogues. The large zone is the whole map. The boxplots of the left column display the distribution of the 1000 uchronic monthly detrended temperature constituted from randomly picked analogues. The color of the boxplot corresponds to the color of the rectangle delineating the region on which the analogues are computed. The red lines on the left hand side of the figure represent the observed detrended temperature of the case studies, from top to bottom : June 2003, August 2003, July 2006, July 2015.

### 194 3.3 Length of the dataset

195 The NCEP dataset contains 68 years. Although the recombination of analogues allows to recreate new  
 196 events, the dataset is finite and hence does not cover the whole range of possible events. For example, if  
 197 the circulation leading to a heatwave has a return period of more than the dataset length, there might  
 198 not be similar circulation patterns in the dataset. In this situation, the computed analogues will not be  
 199 a good proxy of the circulation of interest. Furthermore, even if there are close daily analogues to the  
 200 daily circulation of the event, it might not account for other thermodynamical processes that may or  
 201 may not happen simultaneously and lead to extreme temperatures. This shortcoming is called sampling  
 202 uncertainty (Committee on Extreme Weather Events and Climate Change Attribution 2016, Chap. 3),  
 203 related to the fact that the past is one occurrence of many realizations which could have happened for  
 204 a given state of the climate.

205  
 206 In order to get an order of magnitude of that uncertainty in the reconstruction of probability densities  
 207 of temperature anomalies we used a 500 years long pre-industrial run from CMIP5 (Taylor et al 2012).  
 208 The model used is GFDL-ESM2M (Dunne et al 2012, 2013). We chose this model because it was the  
 209 model available on the IPSL data center with the longest run for both the temperature and the Z500.  
 210 We selected one heatwave similar to July 2015, both in terms of temperature anomaly (compared to the  
 211 detrended anomaly of July 2015) and circulation patterns (see figure 6). We assume that the internal  
 212 variability of the model is similar to the internal variability of the reanalysis.

213




Fig. 6: Temperature anomaly (a) and Z500 anomaly (m) (b) of a July month from GFDL-ESM2M CMIP5 pre-industrial control run similar to July 2015.

214 Analogues were computed for 60 different subsets of the 500 year dataset. The lengths of the subsets  
 215 were 33, 68, 100 and 200 years (e.g. subsets of 68 consecutive years each, starting every 5 years of the  
 216 data set). We then compared the means of the uchronic temperature anomaly distributions for the cho-  
 217 sen July 2015-like month to one another for different subset lengths. The spread of the mean uchronic  
 218 temperature anomalies calculated this way gives an estimation of the uncertainty related to the limited  
 219 length of the dataset.

220

221 Figure 7 displays the results for subsets of 33, 68, 100 and 200 years. When the number of years of the  
 222 subset decreases, the spread of the mean uchronic temperature anomalies increases, going up to approx-  
 223 imately 0.71 °C for the 33 years subsets, 0.62 °C for 68 years, 0.36 °C for 100 years, and 0.14 °C for 200  
 224 years. This information is precious to determine in which measure smaller datasets are relevant for this  
 225 methodology. It means for example that differences of up to 0.71 °C in the mean uchronic temperatures  
 226 calculated from 33 years long subsets can possibly occur due to internal variability without strictly need-  
 227 ing additional forcing.

228




Fig. 7: Sensitivity to interdecadal variability depending on the length of the dataset. Distributions of the mean uchronic temperature anomalies for 60 different subsets of varying sizes (33, 68, 100, or 200 years) from a 500 years long pre-industrial control run (model GFDL-ESM2M) for the small domain of analogues computation.

229 The ability to find analogues close to the circulation of interest is related to both the size of the dataset  
 230 and the size of the domain on which the analogues are computed (Van den Dool 1994). It means that the  
 231 analogues method will get more and more accurate as the reanalysis dataset extends in the years to come.

232

### 233 3.4 Number of analogues

234 For the reconstruction of events by recombination of analogues, we kept the  $N$  best analogues. The  
 235 choice of  $N$  has an influence on both the uchronic detrended temperature anomalies and the statistical

robustness of the study. The best uchronic detrended temperature anomalies are closer to the observed detrended temperature anomalies of the actual events for all case studies

#### 4 The role of circulation in heatwaves

With the parameters kept (Z500, small domains, 68 years reanalysis data, and 20 analogues) we simulated 1000 uchronic detrended monthly mean temperature anomalies for each of the four selected heatwave events (see the analogues boxplots in figure 8). The circulation contribution corresponds to the mean of the uchronic temperature anomaly distribution simulated using circulation analogues. The spread of the boxplots is due to the range of other processes which can, for a given circulation, lead to different temperature anomalies.

In order to measure the contribution of the circulation we compared the distribution of uchronic detrended temperature anomalies with a control distribution built using random days (*Control-1* boxplots on figure 8). The control distribution is supposed to represent monthly detrended temperature anomalies for the given month and the given region without focusing on specific circulation patterns. However, the variability of random summers built that way is not realistic because the dependence between consecutive days is not accounted for. Analogues are by construction dependent from one another, because they are calculated using maps from consecutive (hence correlated) days, whereas randomly picked days are independent.

In order to create a more realistic distribution of temperature anomalies using random days, we also calculated detrended monthly mean temperature anomalies by using only one out of  $M$  days.  $M$  is a measure of the persistence of the circulation that is accounted for. We computed the autocorrelation of the detrended Z500 NCEP dataset for summer months (JJA) on each of the four small domains, for each grid point, with lags from 1 to 20 days (similar to Yiou et al (2014)). For more than 10 days, the autocorrelations median tends to an asymptotic value of approximately 0.1. For three days, the median of the autocorrelation distribution is of approximately 0.65. For four days, it decreases to 0.45. Since the regions are small, the number of degrees of freedom is small too, which means that an autocorrelation of 0.45 is negligible. We hence arbitrarily decided to set  $M=3$  (*Control-3* boxplots on figure 8). The circulation during heatwaves corresponds to a long-lasting blocking situation, hence the persistence is probably more than three days. This underestimation, combined with the limited length of the dataset explains why the studied events are all outside of the distributions calculated using random days subsampled every 3 days.

For every event, the circulation plays a significant role in the occurrence of the extreme. It only explains a part of it, more or less significant depending on the event. Indeed, it explains 38% of the anomaly for August 2003, 57% for June 2003, 81% for July 2015 and 92% for July 2006. Considering only the uchronic detrended temperature anomaly distribution, the observed heatwave is plausible given the large-scale trends and the circulation for both July 2006 and July 2015. Indeed the observed detrended temperature anomaly is within  $2\sigma$  of the uchronic detrended temperature anomaly distribution. The circulation together with the subtracted large-scale trend could explain the observed temperature anomaly. This is not the case for June and August 2003 where the observed detrended temperature anomaly is respectively  $6.1\sigma$  and  $8.6\sigma$  above the mean of the uchronic detrended temperature distribution (see table 2). The smaller standard deviation of the uchronic detrended temperature distribution compared to the random ones shows the effect of the analogues, that is to select a part of the distribution conditioned to the flow. Indeed the standard deviation of the uchronic detrended temperature anomaly distribution is

Event	Observed detrended temperature anomaly	Mean detrended uchronic temperature anomaly	Difference expressed as number of $\sigma$ of the uchronic distribution
06/2003	3.3°C	1.9°C	6.1
08/2003	3.2°C	1.2°C	8.6
07/2006	2.5°C	2.3°C	0.9
07/2015	2.1°C	1.7°C	1.6

Table 2: Observed detrended temperature anomaly compared to the mean detrended uchronic temperature anomaly for each case study.

279 approximately a third of the standard deviation of the temperature anomaly distribution using random  
 280 days taking into account the persistence of the circulation (*Control-3*). Both standard deviations might  
 281 be slightly underestimated due to persistence that was not accounted for. In the case of the uchronic  
 282 temperature anomalies this can happen due to the random pick among the analogue days and for the  
 283 *Control-3* due to situations with more than 3 days of persistence that are not accounted for.

284




Fig. 8: Probability distributions of uchronic detrended monthly temperature anomalies simulated using random days (left boxplot of each subfigure), random days subsampled every three days to correct for serial dependence (middle boxplot of each subfigure) and analogues (right boxplot of each subfigure) for each case study: June 2003 (a), August 2003 (b), July 2007 (c), July 2015 (d). The red line represents the observed detrended temperature anomaly of the event.

285 In order to contextualize the four case studies, we reproduced the same kind of probability density func-  
286 tion experiments for the same regions from 1948 to 2015 (figure 9). We calculated the uchronic detrended  
287 temperature anomaly distributions for the months of June from 1948 to 2015 on the regions (both the  
288 temperature and the circulation regions) defined for June 2003 (figure 9 a)). We did the same for the  
289 other three events. This type of recontextualisation can be interpreted as an estimation of how extreme  
290 an event really is, with respect to its atmospheric circulation.

291  
292 The observed monthly mean detrended temperature anomaly falls between the 10th and 90th percentiles  
293 of the uchronic detrended temperature anomaly distribution for more than half of the years between 1948  
294 and 2015. It falls between the 1st and 99th percentiles for more than two thirds of the years, even though  
295 the uchronic temperature anomaly distribution has a small spread compared to the total distribution.  
296 The years with observed detrended temperature anomalies out of interval between the 1st and 99th per-  
297 centile correspond mostly to large detrended temperature anomalies with absolute value  $> 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ . For  
298 less than a quarter of the years between 1948 and 2015 the mean of the uchronic detrended temperature  
299 anomaly distribution has a sign different from the observed detrended temperature anomaly. Those years  
300 correspond to low detrended temperature anomalies with absolute values  $< 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ .

## 302 5 Discussion

303 The median of the uchronic temperature anomaly distribution is generally different from the observed  
304 temperature anomaly. In some cases, the observed detrended temperature anomaly (red line on figure 8)  
305 is not even in the uchronic temperature anomaly distribution. On figure 8 for June and August 2003, and  
306 for some of the years on figure 9, this is the case (indeed, the monthly detrended temperature anomalies  
307 for both months are higher than  $3^\circ\text{C}$ ). This difference shows caveats in the methodology, and that some  
308 heatwave events cannot be explained only by their circulation.

309  
310 Flow analogues are unable to reproduce the role played by the soil-moisture feedback. Indeed, the ana-  
311 logues do not take into account the history of the heatwave. Extreme heatwaves happen when the  
312 circulation causing the initial anomaly of temperature lasts more than a few days. As soil moisture be-  
313 comes limited, the cooling of the atmosphere through evapotranspiration gets weaker, which exercises a  
314 positive feedback on the temperature. Seneviratne et al (2010) isolates a dry and a wet regime, with a  
315 transition phase between both. The three temperature regions used here are prone to different evapo-  
316 rative regimes. In particular, the Northern Europe region is wetter than the other two. The role of soil  
317 moisture is thus less important (Seneviratne et al 2006). On the other hand, several articles (St  fanon  
318 et al 2012; Fischer et al 2007) showed the role of soil moisture in the exceptional temperature anomalies  
319 of summer 2003, especially for August. The analogues are picked without any condition on the previous  
320 days or soil moisture, and consequently they fail to reach the observed anomaly.

321  
322 The main caveat of this methodology is the limited size of the dataset, which introduces an important  
323 sampling uncertainty, as seen in section 3.3, and also affects the quality of the analogues. As a result,  
324 the analogues might not be good enough to accurately reproduce the dynamical contribution. Indeed,  
325 an extreme temperature can be related to a rare circulation, the like of which might not be found in  
326 a short dataset. The distances between the analogues and the event, as well as their correlations, are  
327 indices to evaluate the relevance of the analogues in each case. A better definition of what is a good

analogue will require further studies. Depending on the magnitude of the studied event, it might not be possible to reconstruct a comparable month by resampling the days in the dataset. This is the case for both June and August 2003, which have temperature anomalies about one degree Celsius above all the other years, despite the detrending. If the event is too rare, it will not be possible to reconstitute uchronic temperature anomalies close to the observed ones.

Another limitation relates to the coherence of the uchronic summers computed using analogues. Due to the persistence of the circulation, the analogues we picked for each day are correlated to one another. Indeed, analogues of following -and thus correlated- days are not independent. In our case, we picked the 20 best analogues for each day. For each event we hence have an ensemble of 20 times the number of days of the month analogues. A proof of the correlation between analogues of following days is that only half of the analogues in this ensemble are unique. However, the persistence is still underestimated compared to real summers. Consequently, the spread of the computed uchronic temperature anomaly distributions is underestimated.

Lastly, this article only considers one month-long heatwaves, while some events as short as three consecutive days can be considered as heatwaves (Russo et al 2015). We have tested how the length of heatwaves affect the uncertainties of the method using a test similar to the one used in section 3.3, for events of different length (not shown here). The sampling uncertainty on the mean uchronic temperature anomaly decreases for longer events. It also seems that it can differ from one week-long event to the other. For a week-long events, the probability to only have days with poor analogues is higher than for longer events, especially if we deal with unusual events in terms of atmospheric circulation. Since the reasons behind those differences relate to the quality of analogues, we intend to treat this more thoroughly in further studies. However, we recommend to accompany any study using analogues as presented in this article with an evaluation of the sampling uncertainty to validate the relevance of the methodology. This evaluation could be based on pre-industrial runs similar to what is displayed here in section 3.3 or on large ensembles of simulations.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper proposes to quantify the role of the atmospheric circulation in the occurrence of an extreme monthly anomaly of temperature. The strength of our methodology is that it is easily adaptable to other regions, and to other events. The parameter sensitivity tests of section three provide general guidelines to choose flow analogues to investigate European summer heatwaves. It is best to use detrended Z500 as a proxy of circulation, and to compile the analogues on a small domain centered on the Z500 anomaly concomitant to the event. We also advise to use as long a dataset as possible.

The results on parameter sensitivities have potential implications for applications of the analogue method in a downscaling or reconstruction context as well. The questions of the predictor variable (or variables), that is the circulation proxy, is relevant in the downscaling context but may vary depending on the predictand variable. The question of domain size has been treated by several authors (e.g. Chardon et al 2014; Radanovics et al 2013; Beck et al 2015) and the results are systematically in favor of relatively small domains, in line with our findings. Tests on archive lengths larger than typical reanalysis record lengths are rarely performed. The results are relevant since split-sample validation of downscaling methods is common practice and our results show that splitting the limited length reanalysis record leads to large



371 uncertainties in the uchronic temperatures due to the limited sample size even using a relatively small  
372 domain.

373  
374 The reconstitution of an ensemble of uchronic temperatures for a given circulation is a first step refine  
375 the approach of Cattiaux et al (2010) to extreme event attribution. Indeed, looking at changes for a given  
376 circulation should reduce the signal to noise ratio of climate change versus natural variability (Trenberth  
377 et al 2015) in what Shepherd (2016) calls a "storyline approach" to extreme events attribution. There  
378 are two ways to compare two worlds with and without climate change. The first one is to use climate  
379 simulations with and without anthropogenic forcing. The second one is to compare observations of recent  
380 years to observations from further back in time. It is then possible to detect a change between two periods  
381 or two simulations outputs. One has to keep in mind that detecting a difference of temperature is not  
382 enough to attribute the difference between the two to climate change, rather than to natural variability.  
383 Indeed, the internal variability between the two periods could be of the same order of magnitude than  
384 the difference caused by climate change. We have shown in section 3.3 that the longer the dataset, the  
385 more it reduces the impact of internal variability on the results.

386  
387 Since among the tested parameters only the regions of the temperature anomaly and of the geopotential  
388 height field depend on the event, a diagnosis on heatwaves can be automatized and computed in less  
389 than a day once the data set is available.

390

## 391 7 Acknowledgment

392 NCEP Reanalysis data provided by the NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD, Boulder, Colorado, USA, from their  
393 Web site at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/>.

394 Program to compute analogues available online [https://a2c2.lsce.ipsl.fr/index.php/licences/  
395 file/castf90?id=3](https://a2c2.lsce.ipsl.fr/index.php/licences/file/castf90?id=3). PY and SR are supported by the ERC Grant A2C2 (No. 338965).

## 396 References

- 397 Beck C, Philipp A, Jacobeit J (2015) Interannual drought index variations in Central Europe related to the large-scale  
398 atmospheric circulation—application and evaluation of statistical downscaling approaches based on circulation type  
399 classifications. *Theor Appl Climatol* 121(3):713–732, DOI 10.1007/s00704-014-1267-z
- 400 Ben Daoud A, Sauquet E, Bontron G, Obled C, Lang M (2016) Daily quantitative precipitation forecasts based on the  
401 analogue method: Improvements and application to a French large river basin. *Atmos Res* 169:147–159, DOI 10.1016/  
402 j.atmosres.2015.09.015
- 403 Beniston M, Diaz HF (2004) The 2003 heat wave as an example of summers in a greenhouse climate? Observations and  
404 climate model simulations for Basel, Switzerland. *Glob Planet Change* 44(1-4):73–81, DOI 10.1016/j.gloplacha.2004.  
405 06.006
- 406 Cassou C, Cattiaux J (2016) Disruption of the European climate seasonal clock in a warming world. *Nat Clim Change*  
407 (April):1–6, DOI 10.1038/nclimate2969
- 408 Cassou C, Terray L, Phillips AS (2005) Tropical atlantic influence on european heat waves. *J Clim* 18(15):2805–2811,  
409 DOI 10.1175/JCLI3506.1
- 410 Cattiaux J, Vautard R, Cassou C, Yiou P, Masson-Delmotte V, Codron F (2010) Winter 2010 in Europe: A cold extreme  
411 in a warming climate. *Geophys Res Lett* 37(20):1–6, DOI 10.1029/2010GL044613
- 412 Chardon J, Hingray B, Favre AC, Autin P, Gailhard J, Zin I, Obled C (2014) Spatial Similarity and Transferability of  
413 Analog Dates for Precipitation Downscaling over France. *J Clim* 27(13):5056–5074, DOI 10.1175/JCLI-D-13-00464.1

- 414 Chardon J, Favre AC, Hingray B (2016) Effects of Spatial Aggregation on the Accuracy of Statistically Downscaled  
415 Precipitation Predictions. *J Hydrometeor* 17(5):1561–1578, DOI 10.1175/JHM-D-15-0031.1
- 416 Ciais P, Reichstein M, Viovy N, Granier A, Ogee J, Allard V, Aubinet M, Buchmann N, Bernhofer C, Carrara A, Chevallier  
417 F, De Noblet N, Friend AD, Friedlingstein P, Grunwald T, Heinesch B, Keronen P, Knohl A, Krinner G, Loustau D,  
418 Manca G, Matteucci G, Miglietta F, Ourcival JM, Papale D, Pilegaard K, Rambal S, Seufert G, Soussana JF, Sanz  
419 MJ, Schulze ED, Vesala T, Valentini R (2005) Europe-wide reduction in primary productivity caused by the heat and  
420 drought in 2003. *Nature* 437(7058):529–533, DOI 10.1038/nature03972
- 421 Committee on Extreme Weather Events and Climate Change Attribution (2016) Attribution of Extreme Weather Events  
422 in the Context of Climate Change. DOI 10.17226/21852
- 423 Compo GP, Whitaker JS, Sardeshmukh PD, Matsui N, Allan RJ, Yin X, Gleason BE, Vose RS, Rutledge G, Bessemoulin  
424 P, Brönnimann S, Brunet M, Crouthamel RI, Grant AN, Groisman PY, Jones PD, Kruk M, Kruger AC, Marshall  
425 GJ, Maugeri M, Mok HY, Nordli O, Ross TF, Trigo RM, Wang XL, Woodruff SD, Worley SJ (2011) The Twentieth  
426 Century Reanalysis Project. *Quat J Roy Met Soc* 137:1–28, DOI 10.1002/qj.776.
- 427 Della-Marta PM, Luterbacher J, von Weissenfluh H, Xoplaki E, Brunet M, Wanner H (2007) Summer heat waves over  
428 western Europe 1880–2003, their relationship to large-scale forcings and predictability. *Clim Dyn* 29(2-3):251–275,  
429 DOI 10.1007/s00382-007-0233-1
- 430 Djalalova I, Delle Monache L, Wilczak J (2015) PM2.5 analog forecast and Kalman filter post-processing for the Community  
431 Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model. *Atmos Environ* 108:76–87, DOI 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.02.021
- 432 Dole R, Hoerling M, Perlwitz J, Eischeid J, Pegion P, Zhang T, Quan XW, Xu T, Murray D (2011) Was there a basis for  
433 anticipating the 2010 Russian heat wave? *Geophys Res Lett* 38(6):1–5, DOI 10.1029/2010GL046582
- 434 Van den Dool H (1994) Searching for analogues, how long must we wait? *Tellus A* 46(3):314–324
- 435 Duband D (1981) Prévision spatiale des hauteurs de précipitations journalières (A spatial forecast of daily precipitation  
436 heights). *La Houille Blanche* (7-8):497–512, DOI 10.1051/lhb/1981046
- 437 Dunne JP, John JG, Shevliakova S, Stouffer RJ, Krasting JP, Malyshev SL, Milly PCD, Sentman LT, Adcroft AJ, Cooke  
438 W, Dunne KA, Griffies SM, Hallberg RW, Harrison MJ, Levy H, Wittenberg AT, Phillips PJ, Zadeh N (2012) GFDL’s  
439 ESM2 Global Coupled Climate-Carbon Earth System Models. Part I: Physical Formulation and Baseline Simulation  
440 Characteristics. *J Clim* 25:6646–6665, DOI 10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00560.1
- 441 Dunne JP, John JG, Shevliakova S, Stouffer RJ, Krasting JP, Malyshev SL, Milly PCD, Sentman LT, Adcroft AJ, Cooke  
442 W, Dunne KA, Griffies SM, Hallberg RW, Harrison MJ, Levy H, Wittenberg AT, Phillips PJ, Zadeh N (2013) GFDL’s  
443 ESM2 global coupled climate-carbon earth system models. Part II: Carbon system formulation and baseline simulation  
444 characteristics. *J Clim* 26(7):2247–2267, DOI 10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00150.1
- 445 Feudale L, Shukla J (2007) Role of Mediterranean SST in enhancing the European heat wave of summer 2003. *Geophys*  
446 *Res Lett* 34(3):L03,811, DOI 10.1029/2006GL027991
- 447 Field CB, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2012) Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to  
448 advance climate change adaptation: special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. DOI 10.1017/  
449 CBO9781139177245
- 450 Fischer EM, Seneviratne SI, Vidale PL, Lüthi D, Schär C (2007) Soil moisture-atmosphere interactions during the 2003  
451 European summer heat wave. *J Clim* 20(20):5081–5099, DOI 10.1175/JCLI4288.1
- 452 Fouillet A, Rey G, Laurent F, Pavillon G, Bellec S, Guihenneuc-Jouyaux C, Clavel J, Jouglé E, Hémon D (2006) Excess  
453 mortality related to the August 2003 heat wave in France. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 80(1):16–24, DOI 10.1007/  
454 s00420-006-0089-4
- 455 Gómez-Navarro JJ, Werner J, Wagner S, Luterbacher J, Zorita E (2014) Establishing the skill of climate field recon-  
456 struction techniques for precipitation with pseudoproxy experiments. *Clim Dyn* 45(5-6):1395–1413, DOI 10.1007/  
457 s00382-014-2388-x
- 458 Green PJ, Silverman BW (1994) Nonparametric regression and generalized linear models : a roughness penalty approach,  
459 1st edn. Monographs on statistics and applied probability ; 58, Chapman & Hall, London ; New York, p.J. Green and  
460 B.W. Silverman. ill. ; 23 cm.
- 461 Hamill TM, Whitaker JS (2006) Probabilistic quantitative precipitation forecasts based on reforecast analogs: Theory and  
462 application. *Mon Wea Rev* 134(11):3209–3229, DOI 10.1175/MWR3237.1
- 463 Hamill TM, Scheuerer M, Bates GT (2015) Analog Probabilistic Precipitation Forecasts Using GEFS Reforecasts and  
464 Climatology-Calibrated Precipitation Analyses. *Mon Wea Rev* 143(8):3300–3309, DOI 10.1175/MWR-D-15-0004.1
- 465 Horton DE, Johnson NC, Singh D, Swain DL, Rajaratnam B, Diffenbaugh NS (2015) Contribution of changes in atmospheric  
466 circulation patterns to extreme temperature trends. *Nature* 522(7557):465–469, DOI 10.1038/nature14550
- 467 Kalnay E, Kanamitsu M, Kistler R, Collins W, Deaven D, Gandin L, Iredell M, Saha S, White G, Woollen J, Zhu Y, Chelliah  
468 M, Ebisuzaki W, Higgins W, Janowiak J, Mo KC, Ropelewski C, Wang J, Leetmaa A, Reynolds R, Jenne R, Joseph D  
469 (1996) The NCEP/NCAR 40-year reanalysis project. DOI 10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2, arXiv:  
470 1011.1669v3

- 471 Lorenz EN (1969) Atmospheric Predictability as Revealed by Naturally Occurring Analogues. *J Atmos Sci* 26(4):636–646,  
472 DOI 10.1175/1520-0469(1969)26(636:APARBN)2.0.CO;2
- 473 Michelangeli PA, Vautard R, Legras B (1995) Weather Regimes: Recurrence and Quasi Stationarity. DOI 10.1175/  
474 1520-0469(1995)052(1237:WRRASQ)2.0.CO;2
- 475 Peng RD, Bobb JF, Tebaldi C, McDaniel L, Bell ML, Dominici F (2011) Toward a Quantitative Estimate of Future Heat  
476 Wave Mortality under Global Climate Change. *Environ Health Perspect* (May), DOI 10.1289/ehp.1002430
- 477 Poli P, Hersbach H, Dee DP, Berrisford P, Simmons AJ, Vitart F, Laloyaux P, Tan DGH, Peubey C, Th epaut JN, Tr emolet  
478 Y, H olm EV, Bonavita M, Isaksen L, Fisher M (2016) ERA-20C: An Atmospheric Reanalysis of the Twentieth Century.  
479 *J Clim* 29(11):4083–4097, DOI 10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0556.1
- 480 Portela A, Castro M (1996) Summer thermal lows in the Iberian peninsula: A three-dimensional simulation. *Quat J Roy  
481 Met Soc* 122(1), DOI 10.1002/qj.49712252902
- 482 Quesada B, Vautard R, Yiou P, Hirschi M, Seneviratne SI (2012) Asymmetric European summer heat predictability from  
483 wet and dry southern winters and springs. *Nat Clim Change* 2(10):736–741, DOI 10.1038/nclimate1536
- 484 Radanovics S, Vidal JP, Sauquet E, Ben Daoud A, Bontron G (2013) Optimising predictor domains for spatially coherent  
485 precipitation downscaling. *Hydrol Earth Sys Sc* 17(10):4189–4208, DOI 10.5194/hess-17-4189-2013
- 486 Rebetez M, Dupont O, Giroud M (2009) An analysis of the July 2006 heatwave extent in Europe compared to the record  
487 year of 2003. *Theor Appl Climatol* 95(1-2):1–7, DOI 10.1007/s00704-007-0370-9
- 488 Russo S, Sillmann J, Fischer EM (2015) Top ten European heatwaves since 1950 and their occur-  
489 rence in the future. *Environ Res Lett* 10(12):124,003, DOI 10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/124003
- 490 Schenk F, Zorita E (2012) Reconstruction of high resolution atmospheric fields for Northern Europe using analog-upscaling.  
491 *Clim Past* 8(5):1681–1703, DOI 10.5194/cp-8-1681-2012
- 492 Seneviratne SI, L uthi D, Litschi M, Sch ar C (2006) Land-atmosphere coupling and climate change in Europe. *Nature*  
493 443(7108):205–209, DOI 10.1038/nature05095
- 494 Seneviratne SI, Corti T, Davin EL, Hirschi M, Jaeger EB, Lehner I, Orlowsky B, Teuling AJ (2010) Investigating soil  
495 moisture-climate interactions in a changing climate: A review. *Earth-Sci Rev* 99(3-4):125–161, DOI 10.1016/j.earscirev.  
496 2010.02.004
- 497 Shepherd TG (2015) Climate science: The dynamics of temperature extremes. *Nature* 522(7557):425–427, DOI 10.1038/  
498 522425a
- 499 Shepherd TG (2016) A Common Framework for Approaches to Extreme Event Attribution. *Current Climate Change  
500 Report* 2:28–38, DOI 10.1007/s40641-016-0033-y
- 501 St efanon M, Drobinski P, D’Andrea F, De Noblet-Ducoudr e N (2012) Effects of interactive vegetation phenology on the  
502 2003 summer heat waves. *J Geophys Res Atmospheres* 117(24):1–15, DOI 10.1029/2012JD018187
- 503 Sutton RT, Hodson DLR (2005) Atlantic Ocean Forcing of North American and European Summer Climate. *Science*  
504 309(5731):115–118, DOI 10.1126/science.1109496
- 505 Tandeo P, Ailliot P, Ruiz J, Hannart A, Chapron B, Easton R, Fablet R (2015) Combining analog method and ensemble  
506 data assimilation: application to the Lorenz-63 chaotic system. *Machine Learning and Data Mining Approaches to  
507 Climate Science* pp 3–12, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17220-0\_1
- 508 Taylor KE, Stouffer RJ, Meehl Ga (2012) An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design. *Bull Amer Met Soc*  
509 93(4):485–498, DOI 10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1
- 510 Toth Z (1991) Estimation of Atmospheric Predictability by Circulation Analogs. *Mon Wea Rev* 119(1):65–72
- 511 Trenberth KE, Fasullo JT, Shepherd TG (2015) Attribution of climate extreme events. *Nat Clim Change* 5(August):725–  
512 730, DOI 10.1038/nclimate2657
- 513 Turco M, Quintana Segu  P, Llasat MC, Herrera S, Guti errez JM (2011) Testing MOS precipitation downscaling for  
514 ENSEMBLES regional climate models over Spain. *J Geophys Res* 116:D18,109, DOI 10.1029/2011JD016166
- 515 Vanvyve E, Monache LD, Monaghan AJ, Pinto JO (2015) Wind resource estimates with an analog ensemble approach.  
516 *Renewable Energy* 74:761–773, DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2014.08.060
- 517 Vautard R (1990) Multiple Weather Regimes over the North Atlantic: Analysis of Precursors and Successors. *Mon Wea  
518 Rev* 118, DOI 10.1175/1520-0493(1990)118(2056:MWROTN)2.0.CO;2
- 519 Yiou P (2014) AnaWEGE: A weather generator based on analogues of atmospheric circulation. *Geosci Model Dev* 7:531–  
520 543, DOI 10.5194/gmd-7-531-2014
- 521 Yiou P, Nogaj M (2004) Extreme climatic events and weather regimes over the North Atlantic: When and where? *Geophys  
522 Res Lett* 31:1–4, DOI 10.1029/2003GL019119
- 523 Yiou P, Salameh T, Drobinski P, Menut L, Vautard R, Vrac M (2012) Ensemble reconstruction of the atmospheric column  
524 from surface pressure using analogues. *Clim Dyn* 41(5-6):1333–1344, DOI 10.1007/s00382-012-1626-3
- 525 Yiou P, Boichu M, Vautard R, Vrac M, Jourdain S, Garnier E, Fluteau F, Menut L (2014) Ensemble meteorological  
526 reconstruction using circulation analogues of 1781-1785. *Clim Past* 10(2):797–809, DOI 10.5194/cp-10-797-2014
- 527 Zorita E, von Storch H (1999) The analog method as a simple statistical downscaling technique: Comparison with more  
528 complicated methods. *J Clim* 12(8):2474–2489, DOI 10.1175/1520-0442(1999)012(2474:TAMAAS)2.0.CO;2




Fig. 9: Evolution of the detrended temperature distributions for all the months of June in Western Europe (a), August in Western Europe (b), July in Northern Europe (c) and July in Southern Europe (d). The regions are displayed in figure 1. The red dots correspond to the observed detrended temperature anomaly for each year.